



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,077	09/09/2003	Edwin Arturo Heredia	MSI-1354US	1406
22801	7590	12/14/2007	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC			GRAHAM, PAUL J	
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SPOKANE, WA 99201			2623	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/14/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/658,077	HEREDIA, EDWIN ARTURO
	<b>Examiner</b> Paul J. Graham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2003.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 9/9/2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/21/2005</u>   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2623

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) was submitted on 1/21/2005. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement has been considered by the examiner.

### *Drawings*

2. The drawings are objected to because in fig. 15, element 1504 should read "Are any *files arranged* in a cluster". Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Specification*

Art Unit: 2623

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: in the abstract, "...executing **associated the** methods..." should read "...executing **associated** methods...". Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 54 is objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 54, the claim is recited to be dependent upon claim 57; Examiner took this to read "dependent upon claim 53". The claim language should be changed to include this. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-8, 16, 18-19, 21, 25-28, 31-38, 46, 48-49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marconcini et al. (US 6834110).

As to claim 1, Marconcini discloses a method of signing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

identifying at least a first portion of the files in at least one cluster (see Marconi, col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or digest algorithm

Art Unit: 2623

description) are identified when put into BOM—first portion of the files could be any of the parts listed);

determining a cluster signature for each cluster (see Marconcini, col. 27, 42-46, each SC is signed with signatures (an encrypted digest) for parts and for the concatenation of all parts in the SC);

and developing an expression that includes the location of the signature (see Marconcini, col. 27, II. 13-22, a BOM is used as expression to keep track of the signature and its placement).

As to claim 2, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 wherein said signature for each cluster is based on a hash code of the files composing the cluster (see Marconcini col. 27, II. 15-19).

As to claim 3, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the application comprises a start file and further comprising storing the expression in the start file (see Marconcini, col. 88, II. 30-40 and col. 83, II. 30-40, the SC(s) processor, is a file or API that starts the application such as a web-browser using the SC(s), which contain a BOM or "the expression" within it).

As to claim 4, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the application comprises a start file and further comprising storing a link to the expression in the start file (see Marconcini, col. 88, II. 30-40 and col. 83, II. 30-40, the SC(s) processor, is a file or API that starts the application contains the BOM which is a link to the BOM).

As to claim 5, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising storing at least one of delegate information, security policy information, time version information, and file identification information for each cluster in the expression (see Marconcini, col. 27, II. 25-44, within the BOM (expression) an expiration date or time version info is stored as well as a description of the digest algorithm or security policy info).

Art Unit: 2623

As to claim 6, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising storing the cluster signature in a signature file (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 15-20, the BOM is a signature file for it stores the digest for an SC (or cluster)),

developing a reference to the files composing the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 25-45, the BOM is a reference for the files (or parts) in the cluster (or SC))

and storing the reference to the files in the signature file (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 15-20, the BOM is a signature file).

As to claim 7, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising storing the cluster signature in a signature file, developing a time version record for the cluster, and storing the time version record in the signature file (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 28-40, the expiration date is a time version record for the cluster (the SC) and is stored in the BOM (signature file)).

As to claim 8, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising developing at least one of a reference to the files composing the cluster, and a time version record for the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 25-45, the BOM is a reference to the files (parts) for the cluster (SC)).

As to claim 16, Marconcini discloses a method of executing a supplemental television content application that comprises files, the method comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

determining if any of the files are arranged in a cluster (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or content or digest algorithm description) are determined a part of a cluster (an SC) when put into BOM);

for each cluster, determining the location of the signature of the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 20-50, the location of signature is the digest listed in the BOM which is available to receiver);

Art Unit: 2623

determining the files that compose the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or content or digest algorithm description) are determined a part of a cluster (an SC) when put into BOM);

and verifying the integrity of the files in the cluster by operations including verifying the signature (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 50-58).

As to claim 18, it is analyzed similar to claim 1 (see above).

As to claim 19, it is analyzed similar to claim 2 (see above).

As to claim 21, it is analyzed similar to claim 5 (see above).

As to claim 25, Marconcini discloses a supplemental television content architecture comprising (see Marconcini, fig. 5 for architecture, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing):

application files (see Marconcini, col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files);

at least one of: (a) an at least one signature file having a signature of at least a portion of said application files detached from said application files (see Marconcini, col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 27, ll. 25-65, the digital signature is a separate digest from the content or metadata (note separate item in BOM)).

As to claim 26, it is analyzed similar to claim 1 (see above).

As to claim 27, it is analyzed similar to claim 5 (see above).

As to claim 28, it is analyzed similar to claim 7 (see above).

As to claim 31, Marconcini discloses a computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising (see Marconcini, col. 64, ll. 23-47, content processing tools):

Art Unit: 2623

identifying at least a first portion of the supplemental television content application files in at least one cluster (see Marconi, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or digest algorithm description) are identified when put into BOM—first portion of the files could be any of the parts listed);

determining a cluster signature for each cluster (see Marconcini, col. 27, 42-46, each SC is signed with signatures (an encrypted digest) for parts and for the concatenation of all parts in the SC);

and developing an expression that includes the location of the signature (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 13-22, a BOM is used as expression to keep track of the signature and its placement).

As to claims 32-38, they are analyzed similar to claims 2-8, respectively (see above).

As to claim 46, Marconcini discloses a computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

determining if any supplemental television content application files are arranged in a cluster (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or content or digest algorithm description) are determined a part of a cluster (an SC) when put into BOM);

for each cluster, determining the location of the signature of the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 20-50, the location of signature is the digest listed in the BOM which is available to receiver);

Art Unit: 2623

determining the files that compose the cluster (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 5-45, a cluster (an SC) of files (parts such as metadata or clearinghouse URL or content or digest algorithm description) are determined a part of a cluster (an SC) when put into BOM);

and verifying the integrity of the files in the cluster by operations including verifying the signature (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 50-58).

As to claims 48, 49, 51 and 52, they are analyzed similar to claims 18, 19, 21, and 22, respectively (see above).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
8. Claims 9-15, 17, 22-24, 29-30, 39-45, 47, and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marconcini et al. (US 6834110) in view of Coccois et al. (US 2002/0112162 A1).

As to claim 9, Marconcini discloses the method of claim 1 wherein a second portion of the files comprises a web page (see Marconcini, col. 14, ll. 20-27, the clearinghouse is a website (web page) and the Electronic digital content store is a web site (web page) and they are listed in the BOM (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 27-45);

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining a signature for a webpage; however, Coccois, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Coccois, [0031-33]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cocotis in order to safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on an open network like the Internet (see Cocotis, [0027]).

As to claim 10, Marconcini and Cocotis (as combined in claim 9) disclose the method of claim 9 wherein the web pages is at least one of a markup language based application and dynamically created by a client (see Cocotis, [0013], the web page is based on HTML, a markup language).

As to claim 11, Marconcini and Cocotis (as combined in claim 9) disclose the method of claim 9 further comprising at least one of: developing a link to the signature and storing the link in the web page (see Cocotis, [0043] the transmission of a digital certificate is the development of link);

and storing the signature in the web page (see Cocotis, [0060-61], validation of server signature is based on signature of the web page, fig. 2).

As to claim 12, Marconcini discloses a method of signing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

identifying a first portion of the files that together compose a web page (see Marconcini, col. 14, ll. 20-27, the clearinghouse is a website (web page) and the Electronic digital content store is a web site (web page) and col. 20, 41-46, the web page content or metadata is part of content SC, they are listed in the BOM (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 27-45);

11. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hunter (US 20020056118).

As to claim 1, Hunter discloses an audio/video (A/V) component networking system (10), comprising: a centralized storage system (230) adapted to communicatively receive a plurality of source components (230, a DVD for example), each source component adapted to provide A/V program data (see [0124] plurality of source components);

and a sink component communicatively disposed between the storage system and a presentation device (see [0079] and Fig. 11, the user station (228), sink, is disposed between the storage (230) and presentation devices (32)),

the sink component (228 or 610) adapted to receive A/V program data (235) from at least one of the plurality of source components and transmit the A/V program data to the presentation device (32), the sink component adapted to enable a user to select an A/V menu data stream (100) associated with at least one of the plurality of source components for display on the presentation device (see [0012] A/V component system; see [0013] central storage; see [0065] and [0124] plurality of source components; see [0071] a sink component can also be a central server; see Fig. 11, element 235 notes both audio (music) and video (TV based content, which is A/V); see [0151] TV as presentation device and menu data displayed).

As to claim 13, Hunter discloses an audio/video (A/V) networking method (Fig. 11, 210), comprising: accessing, via a sink component (228), a centralized storage system (230) having a plurality of source components, each source component adapted to provide A/V program data (see [0128] a DVD player as well as a HDD to store then replay a movie may be provided);

transmitting, via the sink component (228), A/V program data from at least one of the source components to a presentation device; and receiving, via the sink component, a user selection of at least one of the plurality of source components for displaying an A/V menu data stream

Art Unit: 2623

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining a signature for a webpage; however, Cocotis, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Cocotis, [0031-33]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cocotis in order to safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on a open network like the Internet (see Cocotis, [0027]);

and storing one of a link to the signature in the web page, or the signature in the web page (see Cocotis, [0060-61], validation of server signature is based on signature of the web page, fig. 2).

As to claim 13, it is analyzed similar to claim 11 (see above).

As to claim 14, it is analyzed similar to claim 5 (see above).

As to claim 15, it is analyzed similar to claim 1 (see above).

As to claim 17, it is analyzed similar to claim 3 and claim 15 (see above).

As to claim 22, it is analyzed similar to claim 12 (see above).

As to claim 23, Marconcini discloses a method of executing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining if files compose web pages; however,

Cocotis, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Cocotis, abstract, before receiving files requested as part of web page, the system determines the file(s) actually compose web pages by noting their registration with the server).

dependent on claim  
16. should be  
under that claim  
Header.

DIFFERENT FROM  
claim 3 + 15  
must Address .

claim 22 is  
DIFFERENT FROM  
claims 12 -  
Address all  
Limitations.

claim 22 also recites "... having one of link to a signature and a signature."  
object this as being indefinite.

Art Unit: 2623

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cocotis in order to safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on a open network like the Internet (see Cocotis, [0027]);

and if any of the files compose web pages, then for each of the web pages, decoding the web page to determine if the web page has one of a link to a digital signature, reading the signature, and verifying the signature (see Cocotis, fig. 3, after reception the signature is verified).

As to claim 24, it is analyzed similar to claim 16 (see above).

As to claim 29, it is analyzed similar to claim 9 and claim 10 (see above).

As to claim 30, it is analyzed similar to claim 14 (see above).

As to claims 39-41, they are analyzed similar to claims 9-11, respectively (see above).

As to claim 42, Marconcini discloses a computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising(see Marconcini, col. 64, ll. 23-47, content processing tools):

identifying a first portion of supplemental television content application file that together compose a web page (see Marconcini, col. 14, ll. 20-27, the clearinghouse is a website (web page) and the Electronic digital content store is a web site (web page) and they are listed in the BOM (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 27-45);

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining a signature for a webpage; however, Cocotis, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Cocotis, [0031-33]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cocotis in order to

Art Unit: 2623

safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on an open network like the Internet (see Cocos, [0027]).

and storing one of a link to the signature in the web page, or the signature in the web page (see Cocos, [0060-61], validation of server signature is based on signature of the web page, fig. 2).

As to claims 43-45, they are analyzed similar to claims 13-15 (see above).

As to claim 47, it is analyzed similar to claim 17 (see above).

As to claim 53, Marconcini discloses a computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by at least one processor, causes the processor to perform acts comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining if any supplemental television content application files compose web pages; however, Cocos, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Cocos, abstract, before receiving files requested as part of web page, the system determines the file(s) actually compose web pages by noting their registration with the server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cocos in order to safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on a open network like the Internet (see Cocos, [0027]);

and if any of the files compose web pages, then for each of the web pages, decoding the web page to determine if the web page has one of a link to a digital signature, reading the signature, and verifying the signature (see Cocos, fig. 3, after reception the signature is verified).

Art Unit: 2623

As to claim 54, it is analyzed similar to claim 16 (see above).

9. Claims 20 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marconcini et al. (US 6834110) in view of Cootis et al. (US 2002/0112162 A1) in further view of Sudia et al. (US 6209091 B1).

As to claim 20, Marconcini discloses a method of signing a supplemental television content application comprising files, the method comprising (see Marconcini, col. 5, ll. 61-65 for method, col. 12, ll. 45-48 for metadata, see abstract and title for TV content, see col. 15, ll. 34-36 for signing and col. 50, ll. 45-47 for application files):

identifying a first portion of the files that together compose a web page (see Marconcini, col. 14, ll. 20-27, the clearinghouse is a website (web page) and the Electronic digital content store is a web site (web page) and col. 20, 41-46, the web page content or metadata is part of content SC, they are listed in the BOM (see Marconcini, col. 27, ll. 27-45);

Marconcini does not expressly teach determining a signature for a webpage; however, Cootis, who discloses a system for authentication and verification of webpage content, does teach this (see Cootis, [0031-33]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Marconcini with the system of Cootis in order to safeguard the content as originally stored given storage and transmission on a open network like the Internet (see Cootis, [0027]);

Marconcini or Cootis do not expressly teach the reading operation further comprises reading whether there are any delegates for any of the clusters, and determining if a signature is valid based on the delegates; however, Sudia does teach this (see Sudia, fig. 5 and col. 28, ll. 19-45).

Art Unit: 2623

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the methods of Marconcini and Coccois with the system of Sudia so, that in the absence of a primary signor, a trusted other or delegate could have substitute signatory authority to maintain the verification process (see Sudia, col. 28, ll. 5-17).

As to claim 50, it is analyzed similar to claim 20 (see above).

*Inquiries*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul J. Graham whose telephone number is 571-270-1705. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00a-5:00p EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

pjg

11/29/07

Art Unit: 2623



VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600